

REMARKS

Claim status

Claims 1-38 and 47-60 were pending in the case at the time of the current Office Action. Claims 30 and 51 are currently amended herein. Claims 31, 48-50, and 59-60 are cancelled herein. Claims 1-30, 32-38, 47, and 51-58 are currently pending in the application.

Section 101 Rejections

In the current Office action, claims 50-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The intelligent agent is merely a computer program. It is not tangible or functional, and is therefore non-statutory.

Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections in view of the above amended claims and for reasons set forth hereafter.

Independent claim 50 has been cancelled and independent claim 51 has been amended herein to claim an intelligent agent that is a programmed processor which is tangible and functional and is therefore statutory. Also, in independent claim 52, the intelligent agent is a processor that is programmed and is therefore statutory.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 be removed.

Section 102 rejections

In the current Office action, claims 30, 35-38, and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wyard et al. (6,167,398).

Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections in view of the above pending claims and for reasons set forth hereafter.

Independent claim 30 recites a document management method comprising:

constructing models of a source corpus of documents;
deriving parameters from said models for the operation of an intelligent agent over at least one external document repository;

enhancing the source corpus of documents by adding selected documents retrieved by the intelligent agent to form an artificially enhanced corpus; analyzing the artificially enhanced corpus to discover objects useful for at least one task; and tagging the objects within the artificially enhanced corpus to allow for identification, description, and retrieval of the objects.

It is respectfully submitted that Wyard et al. (U.S. 6,167,398), hereinafter Wyard, does not teach, suggest, or disclose the claimed subject matter of independent claim 30. In particular, Wyard does not teach, suggest, or disclose tagging the objects within the artificially enhanced corpus to allow for identification, description, and retrieval of the objects. [emphasis added]

The limitations of claim 31 have been incorporated into claim 30 and claim 31 has been cancelled herein. Also, claims 48-50 have been cancelled herein.

Therefore, in view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 30 is not anticipated by Wyard, and it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 30 defines allowable subject matter. Also, since claims 35-38 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 30, it is respectfully submitted that claims 35-38 define allowable subject matter as well. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 30 and 35-38, and 48-50 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be removed.

In the current Office action, claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mizuno (6,964,011).

Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections in view of the above pending claims and for reasons set forth hereafter.

Independent claim 51 recites an intelligent agent used in a document management method comprising:

a programmed processor including a tagging subroutine operating under parameters, said

parameters causing the programmed processor to search a corporus and directing the tagging subroutine to tag language objects within the corporus.

It is respectfully submitted that Mizuno (U.S. 6,964,011), hereinafter Mizuno, does not teach, suggest, or disclose the claimed subject matter of independent claim 51. In particular, Mizuno does not teach, suggest, or disclose a programmed processor searching a corpus for language objects and having a tagging subroutine for tagging those language objects within the corpus. [emphasis added]

Instead, Mizuno creates document type definitions on the basis of tag examination and, therefore, assumes a structured document with tags is already present at input to the process. Mizuno does not disclose searching a corpus for language objects and then directing a tagging subroutine to tag those language objects. The claimed subject matter of the present application does not assume the presence of tags in structured documents, and instead discusses methods for discovering structure so as to produce and place tags so as to create a document structure model. In fact, Mizuno does not disclose or discuss a tagging subroutine or method of any kind by this or any other name but, instead, works on documents that are already tagged. Even though Mizuno recognizes that tagged documents exist, Mizuno says nothing about how those tags were originally placed. Certainly, Mizuno does not disclose parameters causing a programmed processor to search a corpus and direct a tagging subroutine to tag language objects within the corpus. Furthermore, Applicants know of no prior art that searches, identifies, and tags documents in the manner of the claimed subject matter of the present application.

Therefore, in view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 51 is not anticipated by Mizuno, and it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 51 defines allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 51 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be removed.

Section 103 rejections

In the current Office action, claims 1, 31, and 52-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wyard in view of Mizuno.

Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections in view of the above pending claims and for reasons set forth hereafter.

Claims 31, 59, and 60 have been cancelled herein.

Independent claim 1 recites a method of document management utilizing document corpora comprising:

gathering a source corpus of documents in electronic form;

modeling the source corpus in terms of document and domain structure information to identify corpus enhancement parameters;

using a metalanguage to electronically tag the source corpus; [emphasis added]

programming the corpus enhancement parameters into an intelligent agent; and

using the intelligent agent to search external repositories to find similar terms and structures, and return them to the source corpora, whereby the source corpus is enhanced to form a unicorpus.

Independent claim 52 recites an intelligent agent for searching external corpora comprising:

a processor having search parameters programmed to search external corpora according to the parameters for content, tag said content identified in the search, [emphasis added] and selectively retrieve the content.

Independent claim 57 recites computer readable media tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by a computer to perform a method of enhancing a source corpus in a document management system comprising:

receiving electronic signals representing first parameters including document structure and document domain information regarding the source corpus;

searching external document repositories according to the first parameters to identify and tag document domain and structure information [emphasis added] in the external document repositories according to the first parameters; and

reporting the tagged information for selective retrieval of the tagged information.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Wyard, Mizuno, nor the combination thereof teach, suggest, or render obvious the claimed subject matter of independent claims 1, 52, and 57. In particular, neither Wyard, Mizuno, nor the combination thereof teach, suggest, or render obvious using a metalanguage to electronically tag the source corpus as in claim 1[emphasis added], searching an external corpora according to the parameters for content and tagging content identified in the search as in claim 52[emphasis added], or searching external document repositories according to the first parameters to identify and tag document domain and structure information as in claim 57 [emphasis added].

Wyard mentions nothing about tags or tagging by this or any other name. Also, Wyard mentions nothing about searching according to parameters for the purpose of tagging. Furthermore, Mizuno creates document type definitions on the basis of tag examination and, therefore, assumes a structured document with tags is already present at input to the process. The claimed subject matter of the present application does not assume the presence of tags in structured documents and discusses methods for discovering structure so as to produce and place tags so as to create a document structure model. In fact, Mizuno does not disclose or discuss searching document repositories according to first parameters to identify and tag document domain and structure information. Mizuno says nothing about tagging or a tagging method of any kind by this or any other name but, instead, works on documents that are already tagged in some way.

Therefore, in view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that neither Wyard, Mizuno, nor the combination thereof teach or suggest the claimed invention of independent claims 1, 52, and 57, and it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 52, and 57 define allowable subject matter. Also, since claims 53-56 and 58 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 52 or claim 57, it is respectfully submitted that claims 53-56 and 58 define allowable subject matter as well. Again, claims 31, 59, and 60 have been cancelled herein. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 31, and 52-60 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be removed.

In the current Office action, claims 2-29 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wyard in view of Mizuno, and in further view of Peters et al. (Across Languages, Across Cultures), hereinafter, Peters.

Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections in view of the above pending claims and for reasons set forth hereafter.

As previously discussed herein with respect to independent claim 1, neither Wyard, Mizuno, nor the combination thereof teach, suggest, or render obvious the claimed subject matter of independent claim 1. In particular, neither Wyard, Mizuno, nor the combination thereof teach, suggest, or render obvious using a metalanguage to electronically tag the source corpus as in claim 1 and that claim 1 defines allowable subject matter. Furthermore, Peters does not teach or suggest using a metalanguage to electronically tag the source corpus. Also, since claims 2-19 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-29 define allowable subject matter as well. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be removed.

Independent 20 recites a global documentation method comprising:

- modeling a source corpus to determine search parameters;
- providing the search parameters to an intelligent agent;
- enhancing the source corpus by accessing resources outside of the source corpus with the intelligent agent, where said intelligent agent tags the modeled source corpus and retrieves resources according to the search parameters to create a first unicorpus of tagged documents;
- replicating the first unicorpus in at least one other language to form a second unicorpus;
- and selectively mining at least one unicorpus to perform a selected task.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Wyard, Mizuno, Peters nor any combination thereof teach, suggest, or render obvious the claimed subject matter of independent claim 20. In particular, neither Wyard, Mizuno, nor the combination thereof teach, suggest, or render obvious tagging a modeled source corpus using an intelligent agent. [emphasis added]

As discussed previously herein, none of Wyard, Mizuno, or Peters discuss an intelligent agent that does any tagging in accordance with the claimed subject matter of the present application.

Therefore, in view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that neither Wyard, Mizuno, Peters, nor the combination thereof teach or suggest the claimed invention of independent claim 20, and it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 20 defines allowable subject matter. Also, since claims 21-29 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 20, it is respectfully submitted that claims 21-29 define allowable subject matter as well. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 20-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be removed.

As previously discussed herein with respect to independent claim 30, Wyard does not teach, suggest, or render obvious the claimed subject matter of independent claim 30. In particular, Wyard does not teach, suggest, or render obvious analyzing the artificially enhanced corpus to discover objects useful for at least one task and tagging the objects within the artificially enhanced corpus [emphasis added] as in claim 30 and that claim 30 defines allowable subject matter. Furthermore, Mizuno and Peters do not teach or suggest analyzing the artificially enhanced corpus to discover objects useful for at least one task and tagging the objects within the artificially enhanced corpus [emphasis added]. Also, since claims 32-34 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 30, it is respectfully submitted that claims 32-34 define allowable subject matter as well. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be removed.

In the current Office action, claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wyard in view of Mizuno, and in further view of Hartrick et al. (U.S. 5,532,920), hereinafter, Hartrick.

Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections in view of the above pending claims and for reasons set forth hereafter.

Independent claim 47 recites a document management system operating according to a business method comprising:

providing document management services including translation and authoring services over a global information network to a customer, where the customer has a source corpus of documents to be managed;

accessing the source corpus with an intelligent agent to analyze the source corpus, identify selected objects within the source corpus, and tag the selected objects with a metatag, wherein the analysis results in the generation of document parameters programmed into the intelligent agent for searching of external document repositories, wherein said intelligent agent uses said parameters to identify and tag objects of interest in said external document repositories and selectively retrieve the objects to enhance the source corpus; and

tracking rights in said retrieved objects to determine a royalty payable to an owner of the rights.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Wyard, Mizuno, Hartrick, nor the combination thereof teach, suggest, or render obvious the claimed subject matter of independent claim 47. In particular, neither Wyard, Mizuno, Hartrick, nor the combination thereof teach, suggest, or render obvious tagging the selected objects with a metatag [emphasis added] or using parameters to identify and tag objects of interest [emphasis added].

As previously discussed herein, Wyard and Mizuno do not disclose a document management system that actively identifies and tags selected objects. Furthermore, Hartrick does not disclose a document management system that actively tags selected objects. Also, Hartrick seems to disclose a method for enforcing payment of royalties, whereas the present application does not specifically deal with royalty payments in the manner of Hartrick and/or more broadly, rights management. Furthermore, Hartrick does not seem to be concerned with peer-to-peer networks, transaction routing, and transaction fees in inter-connected corpora as does the present application.

Therefore, in view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that neither Wyard, Mizuno, Hartrick, nor the combination thereof teach or suggest the claimed invention of independent claim 47, and it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 47 defines

allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be removed.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections based on at least the foregoing. After such reconsideration, it is urged that allowance of all pending claims will be in order.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott M. Oldham/

Scott M. Oldham
Registration No. 32,712

Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP
One GOJO Plaza
Suite 300
Akron, OH 44311-1076
(330) 864-5550
Fax 330-864-7986
smoldham@hahnlaw.com

CUSTOMER No. 021324